THE HONOURABLE SHRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 17991 OF 2006

Dated 22nd December, 2006

Between:

R.Ratna Swamy

… Petitioner

And

The Director of Collegiate Education,
Government of A.P., Hyderabad and
others.

…Respondents.

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader and Shri D.V.Sitharam Murthy, learned counsel for respondent No.3.

The petitioner claiming to be the Correspondent of Arts, Science and Commerce College, Velgode in Kurnool District filed this writ petition questioning the proceedings dated 31.7.2006. It is the case of the petitioner that on the ground that 3rd respondent was not discharging the responsibility of Superintendent of the College, memo was issued on 18.6.2005 instructing him not to attend to the duties attached to the post of Superintendent and not to open the covers/letters addressed to the Principal/Correspondent of the institution. Aggrieved by the same, 3rd respondent has approached the second respondent – Regional Joint Director of Collegiate Education, Kadapa, who after issuance of prior notice has passed the impugned order.

In the counter affidavit filed by respondent No.3, it is stated that there was a change in correspondentship and orders were passed on 21.4.2005 approving the candidature of one Ramalakshmamma as correspondent in the place of the petitioner. The same is disputed and is pending adjudication before the first respondent. Though it is the case of the petitioner that as the petitioner neither was dismissed nor removed, no interference is called for by the Regional Joint Director, at this stage. But, however, a reading of the impugned order makes it clear that the said order is nothing but an order of termination. Further it is stated in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the first respondent that the

post of Superintendent is admitted to grant-in-aid. The Regional Director has issued the impugned proceedings not to take any steps as much as the dispute with regard to Correspondentship is pending before the Director of Collegiate Education. In that view of the matter, I do not find any illegality, which warrants interference by this court.

The writ petition is devoid of merits and is, accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

22.12.2006

R.SUBHASH REDDY, J.

VR